

DETAILED ACTION

Remarks

1. In response to communications filed on 25 February 2010, claims 9, 11, and 15 are amended. Claims 1-11, 15, 21-27 are pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
3. Claims 1-11, 15, and 21-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bagley et al. (US Patent 6,963,928) in view of Khello et al. (US Pre-Grant Publication 2003/0007482).

As to claim 1, Bagley et al. teaches a method, comprising:
receiving data to be supplied to database operations in a domain name server (see 7:48-55 and 8:20-36), the data including at least one Internet domain name comprising a plurality of successive labels (see 8:20-36)
said at least one Internet domain name being in a first format, wherein the at least one Internet domain name comprises at least one hostname and at least one top-level domain name (see Bagley et al. 8:20-36);

conditionally converting at least one of said at least one Internet domain name into a second format of Internet domain name in which at least two successive labels of the at least one of said at least one Internet domain name are combined for form a single label (see Bagley et al. 8:37-9:2), wherein the conditionally converting comprises converting the Internet domain name when the Internet domain name fulfills a predetermined condition (see Bagley et al. 8:29-9:2);

supplying the data to the database operations, the supplied data including at least one Internet domain name in the second format (see Bagley et al. 9:3-40).

Bagley et al. does not explicitly teach wherein the internet domain name labels are separated by dots,

Khello et al. teaches teach wherein the internet domain name labels are separated by dots (see paragraph [0058]. Khello et al. teaches to format a domain name in e164.arpa format into a telephone number by removing the dots and reversing the order of the digits. Bagley et al. teaches that to remove “all other characters not included in the translation table such as hyphens and underlines”. As a period is not in the translation table, it is obvious that, with the teachings of Bagley et al., that character would be removed)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Bagley et al. by the teachings in Khello et al., because Khello et al. provides Bagley et al. the benefit of an efficient way of resolving telephone numbers and other entity/device identifiers into Internet addresses as well as accommodating portability of those telephone numbers and other

entity/device identifiers without having to substantially modify or rework the domain naming system infrastructure (see Abstrast). In addition to this, as stated above, Bagley et al. states that “all other characters not included in the translation table, such as hyphens or underlines, are ignored”, and to remove those character. As periods are not listed in the translation table listed in 8:37-55, it would further have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have removed periods from a string.

As to claims 2 and 21, Bagley et al. as modified teaches examining whether an Internet domain name fulfills the predetermined condition in the first format (see 8:37-9:2).

As to claims 3 and 22, Bagley et al. as modified teaches wherein the examining step includes examining whether said Internet domain name includes at least a predetermined number of labels beyond a given origin (see Bagley et al. 8:29-36, 8:60-9:2), said labels having a predetermined maximum length (see Khhello et al. paragraph [0058] and Bagley et al. 6:47-67).

As to claims 4 and 23, Bagley et al. as modified teaches wherein the predetermined condition upon which the converting is conditional is whether the Internet domain name includes at least the predetermined number of labels beyond the given origin, such that the converting is performed for said Internet domain name when the

Art Unit: 2164

examining indicates that the Internet domain name includes at least the predetermined number of labels beyond the given origin (see Bagley et al. 8:29-36, 8:60-9:2), said labels having the predetermined maximum length, and the converting is not performed when the examining indicates that the Internet domain name does not include at least the predetermined number of labels (see Bagley et al. 8:29-36, 8:60-9:2).

As to claims 5 and 24, Bagley et al. as modified teaches wherein the predetermined number of labels is three (see Bagley et al. 8:60-9:2 and 13:5-12).

As to claims 6 and 25, Bagley et al. as modified teaches wherein the predetermined maximum length is one byte (see Khello et al. paragraph [0058]).

As to claims 7 and 26, Bagley et al. as modified teaches wherein the predetermined maximum length is one byte (see Khello et al. paragraph [0058]).

As to claims 8 and 27, Bagley et al. as modified teaches:
receiving data including another Internet domain name in the second format (see Khello et al. paragraph [0058]); and
converting the another Internet domain name received in the second format back to the first format (see Khello et al. paragraph [0058]).

As to claim 9, Bagley et al. teaches:

receiving means for receiving data to be supplied to database operations in a domain name server (see 7:48-55 and 8:20-36), the data including at least one Internet domain name comprising a plurality of successive labels

said at least one Internet domain name being in a first format, wherein the at least one Internet domain name comprises at least one hostname and at least one top-level domain name (see 8:20-36); and

converting means for conditionally converting at least one of said at least one Internet domain name into a second format of Internet domain name in which at least two successive labels of the at least one of said at least one Internet domain name are combined to form a single label (see Bagley et al. 8:29-9:2), wherein the second means is configured to convert the Internet domain name when the Internet domain name fulfills a predetermined condition (see Bagley et al. 8:29-9:2); and supplying means for supplying the data to database operations, the supplied data including at least one Internet domain name in the second format (see Bagley et al. 9:3-40).

Bagley et al. does not explicitly teach at least one Internet domain name comprising a plurality of successive labels separated by dots,

Khhello et al. teaches at least one Internet domain name comprising a plurality of successive labels separated by dots, (see paragraph [0058])

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Bagley et al. by the teachings in Khhello et al., because Khhello et al. provides Bagley et al. the benefit of an efficient way of resolving telephone numbers and other entity/device identifiers into Internet addresses

as well as accommodating portability of those telephone numbers and other entity/device identifiers without having to substantially modify or rework the domain naming system infrastructure (see Abstrast). In addition to this, as stated above, Bagley et al. states that “all other characters not included in the translation table, such as hyphens or underlines, are ignored”, and to remove those character. As periods are not the in the translation table listed in 8:37-55, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have removed periods from a string.

As to claim 10, Bagley et al. teaches:

examining means for examining whether an Internet domain name fulfills the predetermined condition, the second means being configured to convert the Internet domain name into the second format when the Internet domain name fulfills the predetermined condition (see Bagley et al. 8:37-9:2).

As to claim 11, Bagley et al. teaches:

A first interface configured to receive data to be supplied to database operations in a domain name server (see 7:48-55 and 8:20-36), the data including at least one Internet domain name comprising a plurality of successive labels (see 8:20-36) said at least one Internet domain name being in a first format, wherein the at least one Internet domain name comprises at least one hostname and at least one top-level domain name (see Bagley et al. 8:20-36);

a converter configured to conditionally convert at least one of said at least one Internet domain name into a second format of Internet domain name in which at least two successive labels of the at least one of said at least one Internet domain name are combined to form a single label (see Bagley et al. 8:37-9:2), wherein the modification module is configured to convert the Internet domain name when the Internet domain name fulfills a predetermined condition (see Bagley et al. 8:29-9:2); and

A second interface configured to supply the data to database operations, the supplied data including at least one Internet domain name in the second format (see 9:3-40).

Bagley et al. does not explicitly teach at least one Internet domain name comprising a plurality of successive labels separated by dots,

Khullo et al. teaches at least one Internet domain name comprising a plurality of successive labels separated by dots (see paragraph [0058]);

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Bagley et al. by the teachings in Khullo et al., because Khullo et al. provides Bagley et al. the benefit of an efficient way of resolving telephone numbers and other entity/device identifiers into Internet addresses as well as accommodating portability of those telephone numbers and other entity/device identifiers without having to substantially modify or rework the domain naming system infrastructure (see Abstract). In addition to this, as stated above, Bagley et al. states that “all other characters not included in the translation table, such as hyphens or underlines, are ignored”, and to remove those character. As periods are not

the in the translation table listed in 8:37-55, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have removed periods from a string.

As to claim 15, Bagley et al. teaches:

First interface means for receiving data to be supplied to database operations in a domain name server (see 7:48-55), the data including at least one Internet domain name comprising a plurality of successive labels (see 8:20-36)

said at least one Internet domain name being in a first format, wherein the at least one Internet domain name comprises at least one hostname and at least one top-level domain name (see Bagley et al. 8:20-36);

Modification means for conditionally converting at least one of said at least one Internet domain name into a second format of Internet domain name in which at least two successive labels of the at least one of said at least one Internet domain name are combined to form a single label, wherein the modification means is configured to conditionally convert the Internet domain name when the Internet domain name fulfills a predetermined condition (see Bagley et al. 8:29-9:2); and

Second interface means for supplying the data to database operations, the supplied data including at least one Internet domain name in the second format (see Bagley et al. 9:3-40)

Bagley et al. does not explicitly teach at least one Internet domain name comprising a plurality of successive labels separated by dots;

Khelllo et al. teaches at least one Internet domain name comprising a plurality of successive labels separated by dots (see paragraph [0058]);

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Bagley et al. by the teachings in Khelllo et al., because Khelllo et al. provides Bagley et al. the benefit of an efficient way of resolving telephone numbers and other entity/device identifiers into Internet addresses as well as accommodating portability of those telephone numbers and other entity/device identifiers without having to substantially modify or rework the domain naming system infrastructure (see Abstrast). In addition to this, as stated above, Bagley et al. states that “all other characters not included in the translation table, such as hyphens or underlines, are ignored”, and to remove those character. As periods are not the in the translation table listed in 8:37-55, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have removed periods from a string.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 25 February 2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that “each of the independent claims recite “conditionally converting at least one of said at least one Internet domain name into a second format of Internet domain name in which at least two successive labels are combined to form a

Art Unit: 2164

single label.” However, neither the cited portion of Bagley nor any other portion of Bagley teaches or suggests combining successive labels to form a single label. In this regard, even broadly interpreting the disclosure of Bagley as applied to the Office Action, Bagley at most suggests removing a label and scrambling a single label (1800JKL1234). Nowhere does Bagley teach or suggest combining at least two successive labels to form a single label. Neither Khello nor any other cited reference, taken alone or in combination, cures the deficiencies of Bagley.”

In response to this argument, it is noted that Bagley et al., 8:37-9:2 shows that Bagely et al. teaches combining labels when the labels are separated by dashes and underlines. The process of Bagley et al. removes these underlines, and combines the labels into a single label. As such, Bagley et al. does teach the subject matter of the independent claims. The process that Applicant refers to as “scrambling” is, notably, combining labels to form a single string.

Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CHARLES D. ADAMS whose telephone number is (571)272-3938. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM, M - F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner’s supervisor, Charles Rones can be reached on (571) 272-4085. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/C. D. A./
Examiner, Art Unit 2164

/Charles Rones/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2164